

**Trust or Not Trust: Understanding the Effects of Allocentrism & Idiocentrism on Coworker Trust**

Özge Tayfur Ekmekci, Mahmut Arslan

Department of Business Administration, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey  
otayfur@hacettepe.edu.tr

**Abstract:** The concept of coworker trust has gained importance for the last decade due to increased teamwork and collaboration within organizations. However, there is a need to study the concept of trust with emic perspective reflecting people or society's different values, norms and expectations. The aim of this study is to examine the role of allocentrism and idiocentrism, which represent individual level manifestations of collectivism and individualism on coworker trust and its dimension (i.e. affect- and cognition-based trust). Besides that, this study investigates whether willingness to work with somebody else is affected by cognitive- or affect-based trust. Data were gathered from German and Turkish samples and analyzed separately. Hypotheses were supported in a German sample such that allocentrism predicted both overall coworker trust and affect-based trust, while idiocentrism predicted cognition-based trust. In Turkish sample, allocentrism was found to be associated with overall coworker trust and cognition-based trust. Neither idiocentrism, nor allocentrism could predict affect-based trust in this sample. Remarkably, willingness to work with German coworkers was associated with cognitive-based trust. The results demonstrated the differential effects of idiocentrism and allocentrism on coworker trust and they are discussed together with its implications.

**Keywords:** *Allocentrism, idiocentrism, coworker trust, cognition, affect-based trust*

**1. Introduction**

Whether it is directed towards coworkers, subordinates, supervisors or organizations does not matter, trust is a critical variable in the development of any kind of relationship with the organizations. Trust reflecting "one's willingness to be vulnerable to an organization's or another person's actions (Mayer, Davis & Schoorman, 1995, p.712), is argued to lower transaction costs, facilitate inter-organizational relationships, enhance manager-subordinate relationships (Doney, Cannon & Mullen, 1998), teamwork (Lawler, 1992), increase job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job performance (Dirks & Ferrin, 2001) and boost organizational citizenship behaviors (Deluga, 1995). Realizing its importance, many studies have been conducted about the antecedents and consequences of trust. Although these studies contributed to the understanding and management of trust, the previous studies have been conducted mainly by and on Westerners holding individualistic tendencies (Chen, Chen & Meindl, 1998). Apart from reflecting the individualistic nature of Western societies, these studies focused more on the organizational context as an antecedent of trust (Lewicki, McAllister & Bies, 1998). So far, the society-specific factors like cultural attributes have generally been ignored. Although progress has been made to understand the emic nature of the trust, new studies are needed to understand how trust was shaped in different cultures and how people of different cultures approached the concept of trust.

Despite the extensive and well-developed literature on supervisory trust and organizational trust, relatively few studies have examined trust for coworkers/peers (e.g., Ferres, Connell & Travaglione, 2004; Lau & Liden, 2008). In addition to that, few studies addressed the relationship between coworker trust and cultural values. The prevalence of teamwork and interdependent tasks call for more collaboration and coordination among employees, which necessitate the existence of coworker trust (Groysberg & Abrahams, 2006). Besides that, team or group-based reward structures require employees to trust each other to do their best and work hard themselves (Lau & Liden, 2008). Considering the empirical findings and real life examples, we argue that effective execution of interdependent work and teamwork largely depends on interpersonal trust established between coworkers. Therefore, we believe that understanding coworker trust would contribute to the trust literature and help managers in promoting a trusting and collaborative work environment. As being subject to different pressures and influences, each society has different "collective programming", so called "culture".

Like other spheres of our lives, culture influences trust formation by imposing norms and values that shape whom and when to trust. So far, some researchers have pointed out cross cultural differences in relationship orientation, which could affect the dyadic trust in organizational settings (e.g., Chua, Morris & Ingram, 2009). For example, establishing closer relations with supervisors and peers is regarded as a prerequisite to work with them in collectivist cultures (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1994), which is characterized by interdependency in relations. By emphasizing uniqueness, independency, achievement, individualist cultures, on the other hand, seems to promote more calculative relationships and emphasize task achievement at the expense of relationships (Chen et al., 1998).

The aim of this study is in three fold. Firstly, this study aims to investigate the relationship among coworker trust, idiocentrism and allocentrism in two different countries, namely Turkey and Germany. Although Goregenli (1995) reports that Turkish culture is neither predominantly collectivist nor individualist in orientation, based on the results of cross cultural comparisons, many researchers (e.g., House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, Gupta, 2004) still claimed that Turkish culture is relatively collectivist compared to Western cultures. In a number of studies, Germany, on the other hand, was found to be closer to North American cultures in terms of individualism. Seemingly different from each other with respect to collectivism-individualism dimension, we believe that Turkey and Germany could give important insights about how cultural factors shape the dyadic relations between coworkers. Secondly, the study aims to investigate whether Germans are willing to work with German and Turkish coworkers approximately 60 years after Turkish migration to Germany. The third aim of the study is to uncover whether this willingness or unwillingness is related to trust in coworkers.

Before introducing the theoretical section and conceptual background of the study, it is noteworthy to mention how we treated cultural variables, namely individualism and collectivism. Considering the possibility that within-society differences could be more than between-society differences, we did not treat individualism and collectivism as cultural difference variables, which differentiate one society from another. Instead, following the Singelis (1994) and Triandis et al. (1995) approach, we conceptualized these variables as two distinct psychological dimensions reflecting tendencies on the individual level. Like other researchers measuring collectivism and individualism at the individual level, we used "allocentrism and idiocentrism" terms, which correspond to the general cultural dimensions of "collectivism" and "individualism" respectively. Such an approach enabled us to test hypotheses separately for German and Turkish samples, without inferring any country differences. The following theoretical section is organized as follows: First, we will define the study variables, namely allocentrism, idiocentrism, coworker trust and its dimensions. Afterwards, we will discuss about the possible effects of allocentrism and collectivism on coworker trust and its dimensions (affect- and cognition-based trust) and formulate our hypotheses for two different societies known to have different orientations in regards to allocentrism and idiocentrism.

## 2. Literature Review

**The Concept of Coworker Trust:** As indicated before, this study focuses on coworker trust, which could be different from supervisor trust or organization trust in terms of power dynamics and degree of formalization. The relationship between employee and supervisor/ organization is characterized by power imbalance and largely formalized. The relationship between coworkers, on the other hand, is mostly based on informal communication and characterized with relatively less power imbalance (Tan & Lim, 2009). In this respect, focusing on coworker trust could contribute to the existing trust literature. However, we need to explain the concept of trust before talking about the hypothesis and possible contributions of this study. Despite the voluminous number of research, there is a level of agreement about the definition of trust in the literature. While some researchers focus on the behavioral side, others focus on the psychological components of trust. Researchers stressing the behavioral side generally view trust as "a rational choice behavior". For example, Deutsch (1962) defines trust as "actions that increase one's vulnerability to another" (p.276). Accordingly, the trustor must decide how much to cooperate with the trustee (i.e., the receiver of trust) and his/her level of trust is inferred from the level and frequency of cooperative behaviors shown (Lewicki, Tomlinson & Gillespie, 2006). Researchers focusing on the psychological side emphasize expectations, intentions, affect and dispositions (e.g., Mayer et al., 1995; Fukuyama, 1995). Fukuyama (1995) views trust as the expectation of regular, honest, and cooperative behavior based on commonly shared norms and values. Similarly,

Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt and Camerer (1998) conceptualized trust as *"a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based on positive expectations of the intentions or behavior of others"* (p.395). By combining both behavioral and psychological side, Doney et al. (1998) seems to provide a more comprehensive definition which states that trust reflects *"willingness to rely on another party and to take action in circumstances where such action makes one vulnerable to the other party"* (p.604).

Having defined the umbrella term-trust, we could turn our attention to co-worker trust. Adapting Mayer et al. (1995, p.712) definition of trust, co-worker trust could be defined as *"the willingness of a person to be vulnerable to the actions of fellow coworkers whose behavior and actions that people cannot control"*. Like Tan and Lim (2009), we used *"coworkers"* as a word for the members of an organization who frequently interact with each other and have equal or similar power. In this study, we examined the level of overall trust in a single coworker. However, acknowledging the fact that trust is a single, super ordinate factor with cognitive and affective dimensions (Lewicki et al., 2006), we also took into account these two dimensions in order to better understand the relationships among trust, idiocentrism and collectivism. Cognitive-based trust encompasses the beliefs and judgments about the other party's trustworthiness about fulfillments of prescribed responsibilities (Chen et al., 1998; Lewicki et al., 2006). Cognition-based trust relates to professionalism and provides partners with confidence that they will abide by their contract and treat each other equitably (Chen et al., 1998). Affect-based trust, on the other hand, represents the emotional bond between trustee and trustor that goes beyond business or professional relationships, and it is usually manifested as personal care and concern for others (Chen et al., 1998). The key difference between cognitive and affect-based trust is related to interests. While cognitive-based trust relies on one's desire to meet his/her self-interests and has calculative-side, affect-based trust relies on one's desire to be committed to the relationship and meet collective interests. Although cognitive- and affect-based trust seems to represent the distinct parts of trust, they are posited to reciprocally affect each other (Lewicki et al., 2006). Some researchers think that cognitive-based trust develops into affect-based trust because calculative and professional relationships may turn into more personalized and emotional relationships over time (Chen et al., 1998). In this study, we assume that allocentrism and idiocentrism differentially affects coworker trust and its dimensions (affect and cognition-based trust). Before providing the rationale for this assumption, however, we will discuss the meaning of the idiocentrism and allocentrism.

**The Concept of Idiocentrism and Allocentrism:** Culture, which is simply defined as *"the collective programming of the human mind that distinguishes the members of one human group from those of another"* (Hofstede, 1980, p.24) could manifest itself at national, organizational or individual levels. At the national level, culture is not a characteristic of a particular population segregated with national borders; rather it reflects the shared values and norms of a large number of people conditioned by similar background, education, and life experiences (Doney et al., 1998). While at the organizational level, culture reflects the values and norms of people in a particular organization, it reflects psychological tendencies shaping a person's values, norms, behaviors and attitudes at the individual level. Regardless of the conceptualization level, the predominant approach in recent decades has been studying *"values"* in the studies of culture.

After Hofstede's (1980) identification of an individualism and collectivism dimension, many researchers added new value-laden dimensions to explain and categorize the concept of culture. However, among these dimensions, *"individualism and collectivism"* dimension seems to remain the most prominent way of categorizing the culture. Individualism-collectivism refers to the relationship between the individual and the collectivity that prevails in a society (Hofstede, 1980). The specific defining attributes of individualism and collectivism could be listed along 4 dimensions: self-definition, goal preference, adherence to norms or contracts, degree of relationship orientation (Triandis, 1995; Chen et al., 1998). The contrast between interdependent and independent selves is perhaps the most important distinction between collectivists and individualists. While collectivists define themselves with the group they belong, individualists define themselves with their unique characteristics and accomplishments; in other words their self concept is autonomous from groups. Apart from differences in self-definitions, goal preferences of collectivists and individualists also differ. While collectivists place greater priority to group goals, individualists prefer to pursue their personal goals rather than group goals in case of a discrepancy or conflict between two sets of goals (Schwartz, 1990). Given the importance of group identity, collectivists' behaviors are largely shaped by norms, duties and obligations of the groups. Individualists, on the other hand, behave based on their

perceptions, experiences and interests shaped by the contracts they made (Triandis, 1995). The last noteworthy difference is about relationship orientation. Collectivists attach too much importance to relationships; therefore even if the costs of these relationships exceed the benefits, they cannot put an end to these relationships. Individualists, on the other hand, approach relationships in a more calculative way such that if they cannot benefit from the relationship as they expected, they drop the relationship (Kim, Triandis, Kagitcibasi & Yoon, 1994).

The aforementioned differences between collectivists and individualists could affect the nature and quality of interpersonal interactions. By promoting 'I' consciousness, individualism is argued to create loose interpersonal ties, higher tolerance to individual opinions, more individualized and competitive interactions. Collectivism, on the other hand, promotes "we" consciousness, greater loyalty to other people or institutions, stronger interpersonal ties, more interdependent and cooperative interactions (Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 1995). There are considerable number of studies listing the characteristics of individualism and collectivism; however, there are still debates about its conceptualization. The issue of whether individualism and collectivism should be conceptualized as opposite ends of the continuum, as independent dimensions or encompassing multiple dimensions (Morris, Podolny & Sullivan, 2008) has not been resolved. Researchers treating them as independent dimensions assume that people could have collectivist and individualist tendencies at the same time. However, the researchers preferring multiple dimension approach distinguished different kinds of individualism and collectivism. For example, Triandis and Gelfand (1998) separated individualism and collectivism into horizontal and vertical facets reflecting people's level of acceptance to equality and hierarchy. GLOBE study, on the other hand, mentioned institutional and family-based collectivism, reflecting Confucian and Mediterranean cultures respectively.

Besides the aforementioned conceptualization-related differences, there are differences regarding the measurement of individualism and collectivism. Acknowledging the fact that general constructs do not provide optimal levels of measurement, Triandis (1995) and other researchers have tried to measure individualism and collectivism dimensions in more specific level, namely at the individual level in recent years. In order to avoid confusions, Triandis, Leung, Villareal, and Clack (1985) used "allocentrism" and "idiocentrism" terms in lieu of collectivism and individualism. The researchers conceptualized **allocentrism** and **idiocentrism** as two distinct self-construals, which correspond to the general cultural dimensions of "collectivism" and "individualism" respectively. Allocentric individuals tend to define themselves in connection to others, emphasize shared values and common goals with in-groups, and maintaining harmony with others. On the other hand, idiocentrics tend to define themselves separately from others, emphasize autonomy, uniqueness, self-interest and self-determination (Earley & Gibson, 1998). Following this corollary, it is reasonable to expect that people are more likely to have more allocentric tendencies than idiocentric ones in collectivist cultures and more idiocentric tendencies than allocentric ones in individualist cultures (Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai & Lucca, 1988). However, as pointed out by many researchers, (e.g., Hofstede, 2001; Triandis, 2001; Triandis et al., 1985), it is sometimes erroneous to make stereotyping based on culture and make generalizations about individuals. Countries' cultures may be categorized as individualist or collectivist, it seems more appropriate to accept that an individual can be both allocentric and idiocentric in different circumstances (Triandis et al., 1985) and even at different times. Considering all this, we measured individualism and collectivism at the individual level and used "idiocentrism" and "allocentrism" terms in lieu of individualism and collectivism.

**The Relationship between Coworker Trust and Cultural Variables:** As indicated before, many studies are conducted in individualistic cultures, particularly in the North American countries. However, the scant number of research demonstrated that the distinction between professional and personal dichotomies is less clear in collectivist cultures compared to individualistic ones. Besides that, collectivist cultures or people with collectivist tendencies (allocentrics) were found to form close relations and put group goals ahead of individual goals. Because of the aforementioned differences, many researchers nowadays question the validity of the existing theories and claim that the development of interpersonal trust could be different than that proposed in the existing organizational literature (Sanchez-Burks & Lee, 2007). There are many studies focusing on the development of trust in coworkers. However, studies using three factor model of trustworthiness (Mayer et al., 1995) are limited in number. In their model, Mayer et al. (1995) listed trustee's ability, benevolence and integrity as antecedents of trustworthiness. The first antecedent of trust-ability

refers to perceived level of skills, competencies and characteristics that enable one person to influence the other party. If employees believe that their coworkers are capable of producing high quality work, they will be more willing to trust the judgments of those competent coworkers. In other words, people's perceptions about the competence of other parties directly affect the level of trust. The second antecedent-benevolence refers to perceptions regarding the goodness of trustee. When employees perceive their coworkers as considerate and concerned about their interests and welfare, they are thought to trust those coworkers more (Tan & Lim, 2009). While benevolence is related to intentions and reflects more emotional part of trust formation, integrity which is the last antecedent of trust is related to honesty, consistency and justice. Employees believe the integrity of their coworkers if they perceive that those coworkers adhere to principles that they find acceptable. Like the perceived benevolence and ability, perceived integrity is argued to increase the trust in another party. Although they are building blocks of trust, the relative importance of benevolence, ability and integrity could vary in different societies; even vary from person to person depending on values and norms. In a recent study (Tan & Lim, 2009) conducted in Singapore revealed the importance of considering societal effects on trust formation. Unlike Western societies in which ability is the key factor of trust formation, benevolence and integrity were found to play major role in trust formation.

As indicated above, people with individualist/idiocentric tendencies are more likely to form loosely affiliated groups based on needs and objectives, whereas people with collectivist/allocentric tendencies form and stay in a few, stable, cohesive groups that satisfy members' multiple needs and objectives (Triandis, 1995). Idiocentric people tend to believe that emotional and relational concerns ought to be set aside at work in order to focus more on the task at hand (Sanchez-Burks & Lee, 2007). By putting aside affective and relational concerns, these people seem to approach the other party more in calculative terms. In other words, trust building is based on cost and benefit analysis of individuals. If employees believe that their coworkers are competent, thus they can benefit from this relationship, they would be willing to trust those coworkers. For idiocentric people, the major antecedent of coworker trust is "perceived competency". Calculative analysis of relationships, on the other hand, runs counter to the "we" consciousness that prevails in collectivist societies or people with allocentric tendencies (Doney et al., 1998). The likelihood that allocentrics will engage in opportunistic behavior is low, because these people tend to prioritize group goals over personal goals and seek collective interests (Hofstede, 1984; Singh, 1990; cited in Doney et al., 1998). Therefore, for allocentrics, trust building seems to be based on perceived integrity and benevolence rather than competence. Empirical studies support this argument. For example, Mizrachi, Drori, and Anspach (2007) found that Jordanians who have allocentric orientation associated trust more with human motives and intentions than trustee's reliability and competence.

Since collectivists are believed to place more importance on relationships and define themselves with their relations to others, they are assumed to support trust and cooperation (Hagen & Choe, 1998; Casson, 1991). However, this intuitively appealing and empirically supported argument has been refuted by some scholars. For example, Fukuyama (1995) identified low trust cultures carrying collectivist tendencies (e.g., China, Korea) and high trust cultures carrying individualistic tendencies (e.g., Germany, USA). Similarly, respondents from two collectivist cultures, namely Japanese and Chinese cultures were found to have lower levels of trust compared to other societies in different studies (e.g., Child, 1998; Yamagishi & Yamagishi, 1994). Some researchers explain this conflicting result with in-group and out-group distinctions. According to Huff and Kelly (2003), the quality of social interactions between individuals in a collectivist culture depends on whether these individuals belong to the same in-group. Collectivists are argued to have sharp distinction between member's out-groups and in-groups (Triandis, 1995), which make them ineffective with outsiders and result in manipulative even exploitative behaviors directed to these outsiders (Watkins & Liu, 1996). In-group bias and hostile behaviors could minimize the chance of developing trust beyond group boundaries and cooperation in collectivist cultures. This argument clearly challenges the popular notion that trust is higher in collectivist countries and has been supported by some studies (e.g., Huff & Kelly, 2003). Van Hoorn (2014), for example, found collectivism to be associated with a narrower trust radius. It seems that collectivism limits the intensity of trust and make people prone to reserve a given trust level for in-group members, not out-group members. According to Van Hoorn (2014), trust radius might be better understood by examining individualism and collectivism cultural syndrome in detail.

Despite the arguments and the conflicting results outlined above, we still argue that collectivism induces interpersonal trust. We believe that people with collectivist tendencies regard their coworkers as part of their in-groups and try to form strong relations with them. Although idiocentric people have a tendency to trust their competent coworkers, their trust is more transitory and depends on coworker's ability to sustain their competence and performance. Idiocentric people lose their trust in coworkers once the performance of the coworker declines, thus the perceived costs of continuing the relationship outweigh the benefits. Since benevolence and harmony took precedence over trustee's capabilities (Tan & Lim, 2009), allocentric people may form more long-lasting relations with their coworkers and trust in coworkers as long as they believe in their integrity and good intentions. For different reasons, we expect both idiocentrism and allocentrism to positively predict trust in coworkers. However, we expect stronger ties between allocentrism and coworker trust based on the aforementioned premises.

*Hypothesis 1: Allocentrism predicts coworker trust stronger than idiocentrism.*

**The Relationship between Dimension of Trust and Culture:** Having known to be shaped by values, beliefs and expectations, it is reasonable to expect that the development and understanding of the trust could vary from society to society, even from individual to individual. Collectivist or individualist tendencies in societies and individuals could shape the values, beliefs and expectations regarding the interpersonal relationships, thereby trust among people. In individualist cultures, pursuing self-interest through associating and collaborating with others is regarded as a logical and legitimate act, provided that the reciprocal relation is equitable and serves to both side's interests (Chen et al., 1998). Individualists tend to make cost and benefit analysis, which is a reflection of the desire to protect self interests. Since cognitive-based trust is argued to be motivated by enlightened self interest and based on the expectation that both parties treat each other equitably, it is reasonable to expect cognitive-based trust to be related to individualism and idiocentric tendencies. Besides the desire to protect self-interest, task oriented nature of individualism could induce the development of trust based on cognitions. By separating personal matters from work and placing demands not more than officially required, individualism stresses professionalism and relies on the expectation that the other party will abide by the business contract (Chen et al., 1998). In doing so, individualism or idiocentrism fosters climate for the development of cognitive trust.

*Hypothesis 2: Idiocentrism positively predicts cognition-based trust in both German & Turkish samples.*

In a collectivist culture, role expectations are not confined to task performance (Chen et al., 1998) and work life cannot be separated from private life in a clear-cut way. Rather than adhering to universal rules and standards of transactions, collectivists show particularistic concerns for other people by being interested in their personal problems and engaging benevolent behaviors. Social-emotional bond that goes beyond a business and professional relationship invokes emotional closeness and communal sharing, which could result in development of affect-based trust in collectivist cultures (Chen et al., 1998). A recent study conducted by Wasti et al. (2011), in a way, supported this argument. In this qualitative study, perceived benevolence, which involves cooperation, unselfish behavior and support, was found to be one of the most important antecedents of coworker trust in Turkey, which is characterized by collectivism. Since benevolence is highly regarded in collectivist cultures and it is one of the defining characteristic of affective- based trust, it seems reasonable to expect allocentrism, the individual level manifestation of collectivism to be more akin to affect-based trust than cognitive based one.

*Hypothesis 3: Allocentrism positively predicts affect-based trust in both German & Turkish samples.*

In addition to assessing the relationship among allocentrism, idiocentrism and trust dimensions, we assessed whether German participants' willingness to work with Turkish coworkers is affected by different dimensions of trust. The previous studies (e.g., Morris, Podolny & Sullivan, 2008) demonstrated that German work environment is characterized by professionalism and adherence to formal rules rather than affection and intense emotional bonds. We expected German participants' willingness to work with Turkish coworkers will be affected by the cognition-based trust rather than affect-based trust given the fact that cognition-based trust is related to professionalism.

*Hypothesis 4: Cognition based trust positively predicts willingness to work with Turkish coworkers.*

### 3. Methodology

**Procedure:** Although the aim of this study is not to make cross-cultural comparisons, data were tried to be gathered from participants having similar employment status. In order to ensure the robustness of the results, the data were collected from blue-collar employees in both German and Turkish samples. The employees were working for organizations operating in various industries (chemical, construction and tourism industries mainly). Collecting data from the employees of different industries could have enhanced the generalizability of the findings, yet, at the same time acted as a confounding factor. Informed consent was obtained from all participants after the study was introduced; confidentiality and anonymity of the answers were ensured. No incentives were offered to ensure higher participation. Questionnaires were distributed to blue-collar employees on convenience, meaning that people who were present at the selected workplaces took part in the study. In Germany, 370 questionnaires were gathered from the 500 questionnaire distributed (74%). In Turkey, data were obtained from 150 participants, although the same number of questionnaires was distributed (30%). The response rate for Turkish sample was considerably low compared to that for German sample, yet it is still acceptable considering the average response rate figures reported by Watt, Simpson, McKillop, and Nunn (2002) for paper-based questionnaires. In both German and Turkish samples, respondents who had not evaluated more than 50% of the items were excluded from the analyses. Missing values were replaced with mean values calculated for each variable for the remaining 366 participants in German sample, 105 participants in Turkish sample.

**Participants:** As indicated before, participants in both German and Turkish samples were blue collar workers working with diverse organizations. The majority of the Turkish participants were male (76%) with high/vocational school and university graduates (71%). In general, Turkish participants were young as evidenced by a high percentage of people under 30 years of age ( $M = 31.14$ ;  $SD = 8.54$ ). The average working experience and average tenure within the organization were 8.12 ( $SD = 7.83$ ) and 4.96 ( $SD = 6.27$ ) respectively. Of the 366 participants in German sample, 200 (54%) were men having a high school or university degrees (51.1%). The average age of the participants was 38.60 ( $SD = 10.22$ ), mostly between 30 and 40 years of age. Compared to Turkish sample, average working experience and tenure of German participants were higher. The average working experience was 17.82 ( $SD = 9.14$ ) while average tenure within the current organization was 8.87 ( $SD = 7.90$ ). In both samples, average tenure within the current organization seems to be adequate for trust to develop.

**Measures:** The self-report survey included the measures of idiocentrism, allocentrism and coworker trust. Responses to all of the following multi-item scales were averaged to form composite variables.

**Idiocentrism:** In their article, Triandis et al. (1995) used the term "allocentrism" and "idiocentrism" to describe collectivistic and individualistic tendencies on the individual level. They conceptualized **allocentrism and idiocentrism** as two distinct psychological dimensions which correspond to the general cultural dimensions of "collectivism" and "individualism" respectively. Since this date, many scales have been developed to measure "collectivism" and "individualism" at the individual level under the name of allocentrism and idiocentrism. In this study, idiocentrism and allocentrism were measured with the selected items from Singelis (1994) and Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk and Gelfand's (1995) scales (see Appendix for the items). The item selection was made based on the factor loadings reported in previous studies (e.g., Singelis et al., 1995). Idiocentrism (e.g., I enjoy being unique and different from others in many ways" and allocentrism items (e.g., My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me) measure people's desire for independency and interdependency by asking people whether they give priority to the private self over the collective self or vice versa. Respondents rated 5-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree (1)" to "strongly agree (5)" with higher scores indicative of a higher level of idiocentrism and allocentrism tendency. However, it is noteworthy to mention that we treated idiocentrism and allocentrism as a continuum rather than a dichotomy. Therefore, the distinction found in German and Turkish societies are relative to each other. People in each society may carry individualistic and collectivist tendencies at the same time, although they attach differing level of priority to these tendencies. As it can be seen from Table 1, coefficient alpha reliabilities of idiocentrism and allocentrism were satisfactory for German ( $\alpha = .70$  for idiocentrism;  $\alpha = .71$  for allocentrism) and Turkish participants ( $\alpha = .75$  for idiocentrism;  $\alpha = .69$  for allocentrism).

**Coworker Trust:** Coworker trust was measured with 6-items selected from the McAllister's Interpersonal Trust scale (1995). The original scale intends to measure affect and cognition based trust with 11-items. In order to capture both types of trust, we selected three items each from cognition and affect-based trust subscales. While cognition trust is rooted in a rational assessment of the other party's trustworthiness, affect based trust is rooted in emotional bonds between another party (McAllister, 1995). Although affect and cognition-based trust are different in terms of their origin, both reflect one's confidence to another and willingness to act on the basis of the words, actions and decisions of another (McAllister, 1995, p.25). Therefore, items measuring cognition and affect based trust could be combined to assess interpersonal trust between coworkers. In this study, we will investigate the effects of idiocentrism and allocentrism on both overall coworker trust and its sub dimensions. Responses to trust items were measured on a 5-point scale format with "1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree". Higher scores are indicative of higher cognition and affect based trust. The reliability of overall trust scale was high for both German ( $\alpha = .89$ ) and Turkish ( $\alpha = .86$ ) samples. The reliabilities of cognition-based trust and affect based trust were well above the criteria suggested by Nunnally (1978) (For cognition-based trust, German Sample  $\alpha = .85$ ; Turkish Sample  $\alpha = .77$ ; for affect-based trust, German Sample  $\alpha = .82$ ; Turkish Sample  $\alpha = .77$ ).

**Willingness to Work with Turkish people:** German participants' willingness to work with Turkish coworkers was assessed with one item (How much do you prefer your coworker to be Turkish?). Participants were asked to indicate their answers using 5-point scale ranging from "Definitely not prefer (1)" to "Definitely prefer (5)".

**Analyses:** Before testing the roles of idiocentrism and allocentrism on coworker trust, it is needed to determine whether instruments designed to measure aforementioned variables (that is, idiocentrism, allocentrism and coworker trust) are invariant across German and Turkish samples. Following the suggestions of Steenkamp and Baumgartner (1998), multi-group confirmatory factor analysis model is used to test the invariance for two the samples. As Jöreskog (1971) suggests, first the pattern of factor loadings for each observed variables is tested for equivalence across the groups (that is, Germans and Turks). This initial test is known as "baseline line model test" and it is regarded as logical, if not necessary condition for establishing measurement invariance. After conducting baseline model tests, and showing which observed measures are group invariant, first factor loadings, followed by factor covariances and lastly error variances are constrained to be equal. The significance of factor loadings was checked by examining the standardized estimates and t-values. Besides, the robust statistics for Chi-Square, Chi Square/degrees of freedom, Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) were assessed to determine whether the measurement model fit to the data. Measuring the degree of similarity between observed covariance matrix and covariance matrix predicted by the model, chi-square value is desired to be insignificant. While CFI values of greater than .90 indicate a good fit (Bentler, 1990), values between .80 and .89 were accepted as adequate fit (Knight et al., 1992). For the other criterion, RMSEA, values of less than .05 were considered evidence of a good fit, between .05 and .08 a fair fit, between .08 and .10 a mediocre fit, and greater than .10 a poor fit (MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996). After ensuring the factorial equivalence, we calculated composite scores for each variable (That is, allocentrism, idiocentrism and coworker trust) by averaging the responses given to scale items. Then we regressed the allocentrism and idiocentrism on coworker trust separately for German and Turkish samples.

#### 4. Results

**Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA):** As a preliminary step in testing for invariance, we tested the validity of hypothesized three factor structure separately for German and Turkish samples. For both samples, three latent variables (coworker trust, idiocentrism and allocentrism) were hypothesized to be measured with 12 items and these latent variables were not allowed to co-vary. The baseline model shown in Figure 1, was tested first separately and then simultaneously for both samples. Initial results indicated poor fitting model for both German and Turkish samples. The reason for poor fit was found to be related to lack of covariance terms among latent variables. Given the conceptual similarity of the constructs, it seemed theoretically logical to add the covariance terms for latent variables. After this modification, the model improved substantially for both German ( $\chi^2(51) = 213.290$ ,  $p < .05$ ; CFI = .90; GFI = .91, RMSEA = .08) and Turkish samples ( $\chi^2(51) = 82.79$ ,  $p < .05$ ; CFI = .92; GFI = .89, RMSEA = .08). The model is not fitting to the data



very well and further improvements were possible. Although all item coefficients were significant on the assigned factor, the modification indices indicated significant error co-variances for both samples. In order to preserve independence of factors, error co-variances of one latent factor were not allowed to correlate with those of other latent factors. In both samples, the revised models produced a fit much better than the original models. After assessing model fit, the pattern of factor loading was examined using parameter estimate reported separately for Turkish and German employees. The parameter estimates between latent variables and items for both samples were found to be significant ( $p < .01$ ). These results indicated the similarity of factor structures for Germans and Turks.

After checking the patterns of factor structure separately for each group, we tested the baseline model for both samples simultaneously and obtained relatively good fitting model ( $\chi^2 / df = 3.00$ ; CFI = .90; GFI = .91; RMSEA = .06). Simultaneous (multi-group) test of the baseline model yielded similar results with the separate tests such that all indicators were found to be significantly associated with their respective factors. After multigroup and single group baseline tests, we assessed the invariance of full constrained model (also known as measurement invariance). To assess invariance, we specified a model in which all factor loadings, factor variances, factor covariances and error covariances were constrained to be equal across German and Turkish samples. The model in which only factor loadings were constrained (model 1) increased  $\chi^2$  value from 381.95 to 311.23. Since Model 1 is nested within baseline / unconstrained model, a  $\chi^2$  difference test was performed. Because  $\chi^2$  difference, 69.280 with 12 degrees of freedom was significant at  $\alpha = .01$ ; we concluded that factor loadings were not invariant for Germans and Turks. Given the dissimilarity of factor loadings, more restrictive models were not examined. However, all item coefficients were found to be significant on the assigned factor and the relations between items and factors were in the expected direction in all tests (see Table 1). This suggests the existence of factor structure invariance. According to Steenkamp & Baumgartner (1998), measurement invariance is not necessary because it shows only the similarity of the magnitude of the relationship between item and factor. Therefore, despite the dissimilarity of factor loadings, we decided to test our model by using the same items for Germans and Turks. Consequently we used 12 items to calculate composite scores of allocentrism (3 items), idiocentrism (3 items), and coworker trust (6 items)

Before proceeding to regression analysis, we examined the reliability estimates and correlation coefficients. As seen from the table, all variables were found to be quite reliable considering .70 criterion suggested by Nunnally (1978, p.245). Correlation coefficients, on the other hand, suggested the existence of moderate relations idiocentrism, allocentrism and coworker trust. The correlations were consistent with expectations: Allocentrism was positively correlated with coworker trust in both samples. The correlations between idiocentrism and coworker trust were small in magnitude for German ( $r = .16, p < .01$ ) and Turkish employees ( $r = .21, p < .01$ ). The similar relations were found among idiocentrism, allocentrism and sub dimensions of trust. When we compared German and Turkish samples, we found no significant differences in terms of idiocentrism scores. However, we found that Turkish participants had significantly higher allocentrism ( $M=3.87$ ;  $SD = .66$ ) and coworker trust scores ( $M=3.77$ ;  $SD = .69$ ) compared to German participants ( $t(147) = 2.47, p = .02$  for allocentrism;  $t(194) = 2.99, p = .003$  for overall coworker trust).

**Results of Regression Analysis:** A standard multiple regression analysis was performed between overall coworker trust as the dependent variable and idiocentrism and allocentrism as independent variables. Table 4 and Table 5 displays the unstandardized regression coefficients, standardized regression coefficients,  $R^2$  and F values of the regression analyses conducted separately for German and Turkish samples. R values were significantly different from zero in German sample,  $F(2, 363) = 18.30, p < .05$  and in Turkish samples ( $F(2, 103) = 6.29, p < .05$ ). In German sample, 10%; in Turkish sample, 11% of the variability in coworker trust was predicted by knowing the scores of idiocentrism and allocentrism. The results supported Hypothesis 1 in both samples such that the predictive power of allocentrism ( $\beta = .25, p < .05$  in German Sample;  $\beta = .26, p < .05$  in Turkish sample) was stronger than the predictive power of idiocentrism ( $\beta = .12, p > .05$  in German Sample;  $\beta = .16, p > .05$  in Turkish sample). In both samples, higher scores of allocentrism were found to be associated with higher scores of overall coworker trust.

Multiple regression analyses were performed to uncover the relationship among idiocentrism, allocentrism and cognition-based trust in German and Turkish samples. As seen from Table 4 and Table 5, the proposed regression models were significant in both samples ( $F(2, 363) = 12.11, p < .05$  for German sample;  $F(2, 103)$

= 8.57,  $p < .05$ ) for Turkish sample). When we examined the size and direction of regression coefficients, we concluded that Hypothesis 2 was only supported in German sample. In German sample, idiocentrism positively predicted cognition-based trust ( $\beta = .12$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Allocentrism also positively predicted cognition-based trust in this sample ( $\beta = .19$ ,  $p < .05$ ); quite unexpectedly the predictive power of allocentrism was found to be more powerful than that of idiocentrism (squared semi partial correlation of allocentrism  $sr^2 = .20$ ;  $sr^2$  of idiocentrism = .12). In Turkish sample, idiocentrism could not significantly predict cognition-based trust. Contrary to our expectations, the predictive power of allocentrism was found to be significant and positive ( $\beta = .35$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

When the same analyses were conducted for affect-based trust, we obtained similar results. Allocentrism positively predicted affect-based trust only in German sample, but not in Turkish sample. As seen from Table 4, the proposed regression model was significant in German sample ( $F(2, 363) = 19.82$ ,  $p < .05$  for German sample). The model was, however, barely significant in Turkish sample, ( $F(2, 103) = 3.73$ ,  $p < .05$ ). As expected, in German sample, allocentrism positively predicted affect-based trust ( $\beta = .27$ ,  $p < .05$ ). In Turkish sample, neither allocentrism, nor idiocentrism was found to be associated with affect-based trust. As for the willingness to work with Turkish coworkers, while the majority of the German participants indicated their indifference (approximately 60%), only 2% of them indicated that they would prefer or definitely prefer working with Turkish people. When we assessed whether this willingness was predicted by affect-based or cognitive based trust, we obtained somewhat unexpected results. The regression model was found to be significant, ( $F(2, 363) = 5.57$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Affect and cognitive based trust together explained 17 % of the variance. As expected cognitive-based trust positively predicted willingness to work with Turkish coworkers ( $\beta = .24$ ,  $p < .05$ ). However, affect-based trust was found to be negatively associated with this willingness ( $\beta = -.18$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

**Discussion:** The main aim of this study is to investigate the role of idiocentrism and allocentrism on trust in coworkers. Allocentrism predicted coworker trust and all of its dimensions positively in German sample. As expected in Hypothesis 2, idiocentrism was found to be positively associated with cognition-based trust in this sample. The results obtained from Turkish sample were quite unexpected. Like German sample, allocentrism predicted overall coworker trust and cognition-based trust positively in Turkish sample. However, allocentrism and idiocentrism could not predict affect-based trust significantly. Hypothesis 1 was supported in both samples, yet hypotheses related to the dimensions of trust were only supported in German sample. As we hypothesized (Hypothesis 1), allocentrism in both Turkish and German, samples was found to be an important factor for the development of trust among coworkers. As indicated before, like allocentric people, idiocentric people have a tendency to trust their coworkers. For idiocentrics, the trust however depends on coworker's competency and ability to reach performance levels serving the needs of both parties, namely themselves and coworkers. Idiocentric people lose their trust in coworkers if the performance of the coworker declines or they have doubts about coworker's abilities. Allocentrics, on the other hand may form long term and intense relations with their coworkers because they tend to emphasize group goals, wellbeing, integrity and good intentions. Allocentrics take into account benevolence and harmony rather than approaching the relations in calculative terms. By promoting "we" consciousness and emphasizing on group wellbeing and goals, allocentrism seems to cultivate a culture that fosters stronger ties and trust among coworkers.

We expected idiocentrism and allocentrism to be positively associated with cognitive and affect-based trust respectively. However this expectation was supported only in German sample. In Turkish sample, cognition-based trust was predicted by allocentrism, rather than idiocentrism; affect-based trust was predicted neither by allocentrism, nor idiocentrism. The one reason for these unexpected finding could be the meaning attached to affect-based and cognitive based trust. When we examined the mean values of affect and cognitive-based trust for Turkish and German samples, we observed very close values in Turkish sample. Affective and cognitive-based trust dimensions seem to be more intertwined for Turkish sample compared to German one. Although they were found to be distinct constructs in confirmatory factor analysis, affective and cognitive-based trust might not be differentiated by Turkish participants, rendering hypothesis 2 and Hypothesis 3 unsupported. The other reason could be the strong ties between allocentrism and trust development. The trust development whether it is cognitive or affect based seem to be more associated with allocentrism, rather than idiocentrism. Allocentrism seems to play more prominent role in the development

of affect and cognitive based trust by promoting us-consciousness, relationship orientation and cooperation. Lastly, we hypothesized cognitive-based trust to positively predict willingness to work with Turkish coworkers in German sample. In line with our hypothesis, German people expressed their coworker choice, based on cognitive-based trust, not based on affective-based trust. This finding could be explained with formalized, rule oriented nature of German business culture. When assessing whether they are willing to work with a particular coworker, Germans seem to act according to professionalism, rather than emotional closeness and communal sharing. This finding, in a way supports the study of Morris et al (2008), which reported that German employees care more about instrumentality rather than affective closeness in their coworker relations.

## **5. Practical Implications**

It is argued that organizations with high levels of internal trust are more successful, adaptive and innovative than organizations with low level of trust or characterized with distrust (Shockley-Zalabak, Ellis & Winograd, 2000). Trust within the organization is associated with a number of positive individuals and organizational outcomes such as enhanced teamwork, collaboration, employee satisfaction and commitment. Therefore it becomes imperative to understand the antecedents or predictors of trust in today's business world, requiring intense collaboration and teamwork. Besides uncovering the predictors of coworker trust, this study demonstrates differential effects of idiocentrism and allocentrism on dimensions of coworker trust. With such knowledge, expatriate managers may better understand their local staff and manage global teams having members with idiocentric and allocentric tendencies. Although propensity to trust is mostly regarded as a personality trait, it can be shaped by cultural values of society, which are well known to influence the perceptions of people regarding dyadic relations. We believe that cultural factors as distal predictors of the nature and strength of relations could be a starting point for enhancing trust within and between the organizations. For example, as one of predictors of trust, benevolence could be promoted through company meetings, teamwork and appropriate reward structures in companies in which employees mostly have allocentric tendencies. Rather than establishing reward structures characterized with "zero sum games", distributing monetary and non-monetary rewards based on collaboration and equality principle could enhance coworker trust especially among allocentric people. On the other hand, practitioners could use different strategies for promoting coworker trust if employees have idiocentric/individualist tendencies. The coworker trust could be enhanced among idiocentric employees if managers could show that the benefits of collaboration outweigh the costs associated with it. Stressing the importance of professionalism and teamwork, linking positive outcomes of teamwork to individual-level outcomes/rewards could induce calculative process, which is argued to be the predictor of coworker trust in individualistic societies.

This study reveals that employees having allocentric tendencies are more prone to trust their coworkers. If manager can select individuals having these tendencies, there is a higher likelihood that these individuals will be more willing to rely on their coworkers and maintain good relations with them. Even after selection, managers may utilize effective management tactics to cultivate allocentric tendencies by rewarding collaboration and teamwork. However managers should acknowledge that idiocentrism is not a treat for the development of coworker trust. Idiocentrism could still play a significant role on coworker interactions by affecting cognition-based trust and other factors. Although the main aim of this study is not to make cross-cultural comparisons, the results indicated that affect-based trust in Turkish sample is not affected by allocentrism, as in German sample. As indicated before Turkish participants did not seem to differentiate dimensions of trust and probably assumed that affect and cognition-based trust exist together. Such a difference is noteworthy for Turkish managers because violations of one trust dimension could give damage to other trust dimension. For example, acting against professionalism and predefined role expectations could give damage not only to cognition-based trust, but also affect-based trust. Therefore, Turkish managers should be careful about the maintenance of trust and try to refrain from actions harming trust within the organization.

Last, but not means not the least, the finding that the Germans' willingness to work with Turkish people is affected by cognition-based trust has important implications for management. In order to increase the willingness of German employees, managers should stress the importance of reliability, dependability and professionalism, which are building blocks of cognitive-based trust in all interpersonal interactions. Managers

could enhance professionalism by clearly setting and communicating role expectations and performance standards; monitoring whether all standards and rules are followed and giving timely accurate feedback. Apart from this, by showing the contribution of each employee to organizational or team performance, managers could give important insights about whether a particular person is reliable and dependable.

**Limitations & Future Studies:** The limitations of the study should be acknowledged before setting directions for research. The study has some conceptual and methodological limitations, which limit the external and internal validity of the findings. Conceptually, the nature and number of variables included in this study provided limited perspective regarding the development of coworker trust. Our article centers on the influence of only allocentrism and idiocentrism on the development of coworker trust although trust-building may be influenced by a variety of organizational, relational, or individual factors (Doney & Cannon, 1997; McAllister, 1995). We suggest that researchers to investigate the effects of individual and organizational level variables such as propensity to trust and organizational culture in order to provide more comprehensive perspective regarding coworker trust. For example, future research may extend the existing literature by integrating “Team Member Exchange Theory” (TMX), which takes into account the quality of relationships between group member and fellow group members (Lau & Liden, 2008). High quality team member exchanges could act as antecedents of coworker trust by creating a supportive and collaborative work environment. On the other hand, the trust between coworkers could also create high quality exchanges among team members by enhancing more resource sharing. Addressing this reciprocal relationship would be helpful for gaining deeper understanding of trust formation within the organizations.

Since this study focused only on coworker trust, its findings have limited generalizability to other types of trust, namely supervisor or organizational trust, which could be shaped by more calculative factors like reward structures and appraisal procedures. Therefore we suggest researchers to examine the same hypotheses for different referents of trust such as supervisor, organization and subordinate. As indicated above, the study has methodological limitations as well. The first methodological limitation is related to research design. This study provides snapshot view of the constructs since it measures all the constructs and tests the relationships at a single point in time. Although snapshot studies give important insights about hypothesized relations, they provide limited knowledge about the development of a particular variable over time. In this study, we demonstrated the linkage between cultural parameters and coworker trust, however we could not uncover the process by which coworkers trust or its dimensions develop. In future studies, the researchers could use longitudinal designs or collect data through interview technique to make more process-oriented or in-depth analysis of trust. The second methodological limitation is related to response rate. As indicated before, the response rate is considerably low in Turkish sample, Although Visser, Krosnick, Marquette and Curtin (1996) reported that surveys with lower response rates (near 20%) yielded more accurate measurements than did surveys with higher response rates, like many researchers, (e.g., Pinsonneault & Kraemer; 1993). We still acknowledge that low response rates could cast doubts about the validity of the results. Therefore we suggest that researchers obtain data from samples having comparable characteristics, yet with high response rates.

Lastly, limitation may arise from self-report data collection and cross sectional research design. We collected all the data from same people at the same time. Although Harman's one-factor test (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986) and multi-group confirmatory factor analysis demonstrated the distinctiveness of the constructs, collecting single source data with self-report methodology might still cause common method variance problem. This problem could have inflated the correlations between variables and result in spurious results. Several remedies such as data collection from different sources at different times could have taken to rule out this problem and increase the validity of the results. The current study is a promising beginning; future research might be enriched with measures complementary to self-reports. In summary, the findings of the present study supports the belief that allocentrism supported trust development. Despite its limitations, this study sheds light on the differential effects of idiocentrism and allocentrism on different dimensions of coworkers' trust. By using the findings of this study, managers could cultivate cultures that promote trust among coworkers.

## References

- Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 238-246.
- Chen, C. C., Chen, X. P. & Meindl, J. R. (1998). How can cooperation be fostered? The cultural effects of individualism-collectivism. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 285-304.
- Child, J. (1998). Trust and international strategic alliances: The case of Sino-foreign joint ventures. C. Lane and R. Bachmann, eds. *Trust Within and Between Organizations*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, U.K., 241-272.
- Chua, R. Y., Morris, M. W. & Ingram, P. (2009). Guanxi vs networking: Distinctive configurations of affect-and cognition-based trust in the networks of Chinese vs American managers. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 40(3), 490-508.
- Casson, M. (1991). *The economics of business culture: Game theory, transaction costs, and economic performance*. OUP Catalogue.
- Deluga, R. J. (1995). The relation between trust in the supervisor and subordinate organizational citizenship behavior. *Military Psychology*, 7, 1-16.
- Deutsch, M. (1962). Cooperation and trust: Some theoretical notes. in M.R. Jones (ed) *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, p.275-319.
- Dirks, K. T. & Ferrin, D. L. (2001). The role of trust in organizational settings. *Organization Science*, 12(4), 450-467.
- Doney, P. M. & Cannon, J. P. (1997). An examination of the nature of trust in buyer-seller relationships. *The Journal of Marketing*, 61, 35-51.
- Doney, P. M., Cannon, J. P. & Mullen, M. R. (1998). Understanding the influence of national culture on the development of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 601-620.
- Earley, P. C. & Gibson, C. B. (1998). Taking stock in our progress on individualism-collectivism: 100 years of solidarity and community. *Journal of Management*, 24(3), 265-304.
- Ferres, N., Connell, J. & Travaglione, A. (2004). Co-worker trust as a social catalyst for constructive employee attitudes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(6), 608-622.
- Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity* (No. D10 301 c. 1/c. 2). New York: Free press.
- Goregenli, M. (1995). Kültürümüz açısından bireycilik-toplulukçuluk eğilimleri: Bir başlangıç çalışması./Individualism-collectivism orientations in the Turkish culture: A preliminary study. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 1-14.
- Groysberg, B. & Abrahams, R. (2006). Lift outs: How to acquire a high-functioning team. *Harvard Business Review*, Dec 2006.
- Hagen, J. M. & Choe, S. (1998). Trust in Japanese interfirm relations: Institutional sanctions matter. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 589-600.
- Hampden-Turner, C. & Trompenaars, F. (1994). *The seven cultures of capitalism: Value Systems for Creating Wealth in the United States, Britain, Japan, Germany, France, Sweden, and the Netherlands*. Piatkus.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture and organizations. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 15-41.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values* (Vol. 5). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences, (Second Edition): Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W. & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Sage publications. CA: USA.
- Huff, L. & Kelley, L. (2003). Levels of organizational trust in individualist versus collectivist societies: A seven-nation study. *Organization Science*, 14(1), 81-90.
- Jöreskog, K. G. (1971). Simultaneous factor analysis in several populations. *Psychometrika*, 36(4), 409-426.
- Kim, U. E., Triandis, H. C., Kâğıtçıbaşı, Ç. E., Choi, S. C. E. & Yoon, G. E. (1994). *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Lau, D. C. & Liden, R. C. (2008). Antecedents of coworker trust: leaders' blessings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(5), 1130.
- Lawler, E. (1992). *The ultimate advantage: Creating the high-involvement organization*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

- Lewicki, R. J., McAllister, D. & Bies, R. (1998). Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 439-458.
- Lewicki, R. J., Tomlinson, E. C. & Gillespie, N. (2006). Models of interpersonal trust development: Theoretical approaches, empirical evidence, and future directions. *Journal of Management*, 32(6), 991-1022.
- MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W. & Sugawara, H. M. (1996). Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological Methods*, 1, 130-149.
- Markus, H. R. & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological review*, 98(2), 224.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H. & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709-734.
- McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect-and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 24-59.
- Mizrachi, N., Drori, I. & Anspach, R. R. (2007). Repertoires of trust: The practice of trust in a multinational organization amid political conflict. *American Sociological Review*, 72(1), 143-165.
- Morris, M. W., Podolny, J. & Sullivan, B. N. (2008). Culture and coworker relations: Interpersonal patterns in American, Chinese, German, and Spanish divisions of a global retail bank. *Organization Science*, 19(4), 517-532.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Pinsonneault, A. & Kraemer, K. L. (1993). Survey research methodology in management information systems: an assessment. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 3, 75-105.
- Podsakoff, P. M. & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management*, 12(4), 531-544.
- Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S. & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 393-404.
- Sanchez-Burks, J. & Lee, F. (2007). Cultural psychology of workways. *Handbook of Cultural Psychology*, 1, 346-369.
- Schwartz, B. (1990). The creation and destruction of value. *American Psychologist*, 45(1), 7-15.
- Shockley-Zalabak, P., Ellis, K. & Winograd, G. (2000). Organizational trust: What it means, why it matters. *Organization Development Journal*, 18(4), 35-48.
- Singelis, T. M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20(5), 580-591.
- Singelis, T. M., Triandis, H. C., Bhawuk, D. P. & Gelfand, M. J. (1995). Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross-cultural Research*, 29(3), 240-275.
- Steenkamp, J. B. E. & Baumgartner, H. (1998). Assessing measurement invariance in cross-national consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25(1), 78-107.
- Tan, H. H., & Lim, A. K. (2009). Trust in coworkers and trust in organizations. *The Journal of Psychology*, 143(1), 45-66.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism & collectivism*. Westview Press.
- Triandis, H. C. (2001). Individualism & collectivism and personality. *Journal of Personality*, 69(6), 907-924.
- Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M. & Lucca, N. (1988). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social psychology*, 54(2), 323.
- Triandis, H. C. & Gelfand, M. J. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(1), 118.
- Triandis, H. C., Leung, K., Villareal, M. J. & Clack, F. I. (1985). Allocentric versus idiocentric tendencies: Convergent and discriminant validation. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 19(4), 395-415.
- Wasti, S. A., Tan, H. H. & Erdil, S. E. (2011). Antecedents of trust across foci: A comparative study of Turkey and China. *Management and Organization Review*, 7(2), 279-302.
- Watkins, H. S. & Liu, R. (1996). Collectivism, individualism and in-group membership: implications for consumer complaining behaviors in multicultural contexts. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 8(3-4), 69-96.
- Watt, S., Simpson, C., McKillop, C. & Nunn, V. (2002). Electronic course surveys: does automating feedback and reporting give better results? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 27(4), 325-337.

- Van Hoorn, A. (2014). Individualist and collectivist culture and trust radius: A multilevel approach. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 2(1).
- Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., Marquette, J. & Curtin, M. (1996). Mail surveys for election forecasting? An evaluation of the Columbus Dispatch poll. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 60(2), 181-227.
- Yamagishi, T. & Yamagishi, M. (1994). Trust and commitment in the United States and Japan. *Motivation and Emotion*, 18(2), 129-166.

## Appendix

### Idiocentrism

1. I enjoy being unique and different from others in many ways
2. I often do my own thing.
3. My personal identity independent of others, is very important to me.

### Allocentrism

1. My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me.
2. It is important to maintain harmony within my group
3. Before taking a decision, it is important to consult with my close friends

### Coworker trust

1. We have a sharing relationship. We can both freely share our ideas, feelings, and hopes.
2. I can talk freely to this individual about difficulties I am having at work and know that (s)he will want to listen
3. We would both feel a sense of loss if one of us was transferred and we could no longer work together
4. This person approaches his/her job with professionalism and dedication.
5. Given this person's track record, I see no reason to doubt his/her competence and preparation for the job
6. I can rely on this person not to make my job more difficult by careless work.

**Table 1: Results of Multigroup Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

Path from _to _	German			Turkish		
	B	SE (b)	B	B	SE (b)	B
Id1 to Idiocentrism	.75	.06	.85**	.92	.10	.86**
Id2 to Idiocentrism	.58	.05	.76**	.74	.10	.69**
Id3 to Idiocentrism	.12	.05	.16*	.64	.10	.63**
Al1 to Allocentrism	.42	.05	.64**	.72	.12	.82**
Al2 to Allocentrism	.48	.06	.62**	.51	.11	.56**
Al3 to Allocentrism	.22	.06	.24**	.28	.08	.35*
Tr1 to Trust	.65	.05	.67**	.67	.09	.68**
Tr2 to Trust	.63	.05	.64**	.73	.08	.73**
Tr3 to Trust	.64	.05	.62**	.60	.10	.59**
Tr4 to Trust	.97	.05	.89**	.59	.07	.72**
Tr5 to Trust	.92	.05	.86**	.54	.08	.70**
Tr6 to Trust	.67	.05	.69**	.74	.09	.76**
<b>Covariance</b>						
Allocentrism-Trust.	.35**	.05		.35**	.09	--
Idiocentrism-Trust	.35**	.05		.35**	.09	--
Allocentrism-Idiocentrism	.40**	.07		.44**	.11	--

**Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Variables of Interest--German Sample**

	M	SD	A	1	2	3	4	5
1. Idiocentrism	3.98	.60	.70	1				
2.Allocentrism	3.70	.55	.71		1			
3.C.Trust (total)	3.53	.69	.89			1		
4.Affect-trust	3.40	.85	.82				1	
5.Cog.trust	3.66	.92	.85					1

Note: \*: significant at .05 level; \*\* significant at .01 level.

**Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Variables of Interest--Turkish Sample**

	M	SD	A	1	2	3	4	5
1. Idiocentrism	3.93	.87	.75	1				
2.Allocentrism	3.87	.66	.69		1			
3.C.Trust (total)	3.77	.82	.86			1		
4.Affect-trust	3.73	.79	.77				1	
5.Cog.trust	3.80	.71	.77					1

Note: \*: significant at .05 level; \*\* significant at .01 level.

**Table 4: Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Affect and Cognition-Based Trust: German Sample (n=366)**

	Overall Coworker Trust			Affect-based trust			Cognition-based trust		
	B	SE (B)	$\beta$	B	SE (B)	$\beta$	B	SE (B)	B
Idiocentrism	.16	.07	.12	.14	.07	.10*	.18	.08	.12*
Allocentrism	.38	.08	.25**	.43	.08	.27**	.32	.09	.19**
R <sup>2</sup>	.10			.10			.06		
F	18.30			19.81			12.11		

**Table 5: Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Affect and Cognition-Based Trust: Turkish Sample (n=105)**

	Overall Coworker Trust			Affect-based trust			Cognition-based trust		
	B	SE (B)	$\beta$	B	SE (B)	$\beta$	B	SE (B)	B
Idiocentrism	.12	.08	.16	.17	.09	.19	.08	.08	.10
Allocentrism	.28	.10	.26**	.18	.12	.15	.37	.10	.35**
R <sup>2</sup>	.11			.07			.15		
F	6.29			3.73			8.57		